

March 5, 1980

LB 637

use of the word "gasohol", which to my knowledge will need to be very definitely specified what will be contained in a gasohol word. We are all familiar with the arguments that went on regarding coal slurry pipelines and their ability or inability to use the right of eminent domain which belongs to all pipelines that carry gas, oil, other products, but at the time that that was written nobody ever heard of coal slurry. So coal slurry pipelines do not have the right of eminent domain. That example should bring home to us that in these changing times as has been spoken of by Senator Maresh, Senator Kahle and Senator Kremer, in these changing times let us use the English language in a broader sense as we approach a constitutional amendment to be sure that we include things that we can use this fund for other than a specific gasohol product. There are other things that are just around the corner that are the solution to our energy problems. There is nothing in the current history or even the immediate past history that is going to be beneficial to this state and this society in handling eighteen, nineteen percent interest rates. It just isn't there. It is new ideas that are coming along and as we go for a constitutional change, go for words that will give us some advantage not to hold us back. Example, the educational service units are a political subdivision and under this constitutional amendment they would have the ability to finance gasohol plants, whatever that would be, and the State of Nebraska would automatically guarantee the bonds that that ESU would write for the construction of a gasohol plant. We would not do it under any other conditions except for gasohol plants. Senator Maresh has told me, and this is for the record, that that word "gasohol" has been changed to "alcohol". This is still very specific and very small and very minute as it would affect the problem that we are trying to talk to, and I further bring critically support to LB 637...would the money that would be in the fund, would it be available as part of the financing of the land or transportation facilities to or from an alcohol plant or gasohol plant? This amendment as I would read it states for the construction, and land is not constructed. We must do something and we must show leadership and Senator Maresh is doing that in LB 637, but it should be progressive leadership and not a narrowminded one-shot proposition. This is way too serious to pass on quickly. Support this amendment, but support it critically so that we can get it the way we want it.

PRESIDENT: All right, I guess, Senator Maresh....Senator Maresh, you may close on the bill.

SENATOR MARESH: Thank you, Mr. President. In answer to